



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,259	02/20/2004	Kurt Andersson	73891	2258
30593 7590 06/07/2007 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195			EXAMINER PETERSON, KENNETH E	
			ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/708,259

Applicant(s)

ANDERSSON, KURT

Examiner

Kenneth E. Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,10 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,10 and 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The amendment filed 08 May 07 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

Claim 15 – there is no discussion in the disclosure, as originally filed, of a size determination step.

Claim 18 - there is no discussion in the disclosure, as originally filed, about how much of the waves are clamped.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

2. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the last paragraph of claim 14, the term "substantial portions" is indefinite. Reviewers of a patent having this terminology would have no way of knowing what would or would not constitute a "substantial portion".

In claims 15, it is not clear what step is actually occurring. Is this "determining step" taking place in the engineer's head? How would one verify that someone is infringing?

In claim 18, the term "substantial portions" is indefinite. Reviewers of a patent having this terminology would have no way of knowing what would or would not constitute a "substantial portion".

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1,8,10,13-15,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McCabe (5,604,044), who shows a method with all of the recited steps including;

Feeding a strip (figure 2),

Cutting the strip (e.g. 37, figure 6) to form wavy edges,

Clamping the wavy edges (16,18, figure 4),

Machining/stamping/deforming the cut strip (22,14),

Removing/separating the wavy edges (repeatedly referred to as "scrap", and thus intrinsically removed/separated). See lines 15,16, column 3, lines 36,37, column 4, line 58, column 5, etc.).

In regards to claim 10, see lines 32,33, column 6.

In regards to claim 15, someone must have made that determination.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,8,10 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCabe (5,604,044).

McCabe shows a method with most of the recited steps as set forth above.

With regards to claim 16, McCabe is silent on the exact size of his wave edges, but discusses how they can come in a variety of sizes (lines 4-37, column 6). Given McCabes suggestion to try different sizes, and given that many different size products can be made from the technique, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the waves be less than or equal to 50mm.

The following is in regard to all claims. If, for some reason, Applicant perceives that McCabe's scrap is left on, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to remove/separate the scrap from the end product. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have removed the scrap, as is well known, so that the end product didn't have scrap on it.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Made of record but not relied on is a patent to Zahn showing wavy cutting.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

kp



KENNETH E. PETERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER